

HOGAN & HARTSON

Hogan & Hartson LLP
Columbia Square
555 Thirteenth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004
+1.202.637.5600 **Tel**
+1.202.637.5910 **Fax**

www.hhlaw.com

January 19, 2010

Daniel L. Brenner
Partner
202.637.5532
DLBrenner@hhlaw.com

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

**Re: Notice of *Ex Parte* Presentation – National Broadband Plan (NBP)
GN Docket Nos. 09-47, 09-51, and 09-137, NBP Public Notice #16**

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On January 15, 2010, Robert Miron, Chairman, Bright House Networks, Steve Miron, CEO, Bright House Networks, and Nomi Bergman, President, Bright House Networks met with the following members of the National Broadband Plan Task Force: Blair Levin, Executive Director; Phil Bellaria, Director Scenario Planning and Steven Rosenberg, Infrastructure Manager, Office of Strategic Planning and Policy. The Bright House Network (BHN) executives addressed the following points that relate in particular to steps to increase broadband adoption, raised in NBP Public Notice #16.:

1. Today, BHN offers a range of broadband options at different prices, including a standard tier with maximum speeds of 10mbps downstream by 1mbps upstream, a “turbo” tier with maximum speeds of 20mbps downstream and by 2 mps upstream, and a newly introduced wideband [DOCSIS 3.0] with maximum speeds of 40 mps downstream and 4mbps upstream. This variety of speeds and prices has helped to increase adoption in BHN’s markets. The National Broadband Plan should focus on ways to decrease the cost of inputs to broadband. By doing so, broadband providers like BHN can continue to expand and improve services and to continue to provide both lower priced services as well as higher throughput services. It should also promote greater availability of spectrum to new entrants like BHN through its action rules and by adopting broadband roaming rules.

2. One major cost input for BHN are pole attachment rates. The Commission should recognize that commingled services provided by cable via attachments to utility company poles impose no greater burden on the pole owners. The cable service rate is fully compensable to pole owners and should be the rate for all commingled services. Maintaining fully compensable,

but low pole rates will best promote broadband deployment and, in turn, keep customer prices low, spurring increased adoption.

3. The FCC should also recommend that Congress include poles owned by municipalities and cooperatives under the pole rate provisions of Section 224. These pole owners own facilities that are critical to deploying broadband in rural areas. Broadband providers like BHN find themselves in a "take it or leave it" position with these pole owners. Their continued exclusion from the pole rate setting process applicable to all other pole owners is an impediment to universal broadband availability.

4. Broadband providers like BHN also face potential new costs from a new revenue model from Internet destinations that seek a per-subscriber fee from every BHN broadband customer, whether or not that customer uses that website. Up until now, the model for pay websites has been that only customers who want access to fee-based content on the web pay the website directly. For purposes of the Broadband Plan, the upshot of the new model is to increase the input costs of broadband providers whether or not the customer is interested in the website's content. While economic models for the internet are still evolving, the Plan should recognize that across-the-board costs inputs to broadband providers, such as high pole rates or add-on fees, can affect adoption rates.

Should you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D. Brenner", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Daniel L. Brenner

cc: Blair Levin
Phil Bellaria
Steven Rosenberg